UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|------------------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/694,314 | 10/27/2003 | Edgar Hoppe | 070255.0630 | 3551 |
| 86528 King & Spaldin | 7590 10/27/201 g LLP | EXAMINER | | |
| 401 Congress A | | NGUYEN BA, HOANG VU A | | |
| Suite 3200 Austin, TX 787 | 01 | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| | | | 2421 | |
| | | | | |
| | | | NOTIFICATION DATE | DELIVERY MODE |
| | | | 10/27/2010 | ELECTRONIC |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

AustinUSPTO@kslaw.com AustinIP@kslaw.com

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

| Application No. | Applicant(s) | |
|-----------------------|--------------|--|
| 10/694,314 | HOPPE ET AL. | |
| Examiner | Art Unit | |
| Hoang-Vu A. Nguyen-Ba | 2421 | |

| | Hoang-vu A. Nguyen-ba | 2421 | |
|--|--|---|--|
| The MAILING DATE of this communication appea | ars on the cover sheet with the c | correspondence add | ress |
| THE REPLY FILED 15 October 2010 FAILS TO PLACE THIS A | PPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR | R ALLOWANCE. | |
| 1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following reapplication in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appe for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 Cl periods: | eplies: (1) an amendment, affidavi al (with appeal fee) in compliance | t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or | hich places the (3) a Request |
| a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing | date of the final rejection. | | |
| b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Ac no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b) | ter than SIX MONTHS from the mailing o). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE | date of the final rejection | n. |
| MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f) Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extender 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the sleet forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later that may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL | on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.1. ension and the corresponding amount on nortened statutory period for reply origi | of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Offic | ate extension fee e action; or (2) as |
| The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in complifiling the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exten Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed with | sion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to | avoid dismissal of the | |
| <u>AMENDMENTS</u> | | | |
| The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, b They raise new issues that would require further con They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belov They are not deemed to place the application in bette appeal; and/or | sideration and/or search (see NOT v); | E below); | |
| (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a converse NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)). | orresponding number of finally reje | ected claims. | |
| 4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12 | 1 See attached Notice of Non-Cor | mnliant Amendment (I | PTOL-324) |
| 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): | | inpliant Americanient (i | 1 OL-324). |
| Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be alk non-allowable claim(s). | | imely filed amendmer | nt canceling the |
| 7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provious. The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: | | be entered and an ex | xplanation of |
| AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE | | | |
| 8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). | | | |
| The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overshowing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation | rercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea and was not earlier presented. Se | ıl and/or appellant fails ee 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1) | s to provide a). |
| REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER | of the status of the claims after er | illy is below of allacin | eu. |
| 11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but | does NOT place the application in | condition for allowan | ce because: |
| 12. ☑ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). (I 13. ☐ Other: | PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s) | | |
| | /Hoang-Vu Antony Nguy Primary Examiner, Art U | | |

Applicant essentially argued that Sawaichi does not explicitly teach displaying the satellite-transmitted non-video data as evidenced by the portion of Sawaichi that mentions that the extracted image information is shown on the television screen whereas the digital data (i.e., the satellite-transmitted non-video data) is stored in the information processing device 9.

In response, it is respectfully noted that the above statement of Sawaichi does not explicitly assert that the extracted image information is displayed and the digital data is not to be displayed. The statement merely says that the digital data is stored in the information processing device 9 (e.g., a computer). If need be, the digital data stored on the computer can be displayed at the same time with the image information as a visual aid. If the digital data is not to be displayed than one would wonder what would be the use of transmitting the digital data during an interactive video teleconference.

Applicant further argued that Sawaichi does not teach user interaction with the digital data. In response, it is noted that the user input can be voice inputted to the microphone of the camera and processed by a voice recognition package installed on the computer 6 (see [0033]). Using this setup a lecture can issue commands to the computer in order to manipulate the digital data.

Since Sawaichi does indeed teach the two above claim requirements, Sawaichi does teach the claimed transmitting the user interaction with the satellite-transmitted non-video data.

For other independent claims and dependent claims, see previous Office action.